Coins and Winckelmann. Winckelmann and coins

Andrew Burnett

All that I have cited as evidence – paintings, statues, gems and coins – I have myself seen and examined repeatedly. However, to aid the reader's understanding, I have nonetheless cited from books both gems and coins that are tolerably engraved.¹

In these words, which occur in the Preface to his *History of Ancient Art* (*Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums*), Johann Joachim Winckelmann made clear the importance of using coins as part of his investigations, and of examining them personally alongside the other media he cited. In this article, I examine the relationship between Winckelmann and coins in three ways: firstly, to explore the extent of his knowledge of coins, and it can be shown that he was very knowledgeable about ancient coins and the relevant literature; secondly, to examine the way he uses them in his work, in particular the *History*, where I suggest that Winckelmann regarded coins as being less important than other media, even though he made extensive use of them; and, finally, to evaluate his impact on subsequent studies of coins, in the later eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, where it is suggested that his influence on numismatic scholarship over two hundred years was much greater than has previously been recognised. These are all substantial topics, and the aim of the paper is to focus only on some highlights, rather than aiming to be comprehensive.

Winckelmann's knowledge of and use of coins was examined only ten years ago by the eminent numismatist François de Callataÿ.² His article included an appendix giving many passages in which Winckelmann cited coins, from his *Geschichte* of 1764, his *Monumenti Antichi Inediti* of 1767, and from Walther Rehm's

¹ Johann Joachim Winckelmann, *Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums*, Dresden: Walther, 1764 (= Winckelmann, *History*), xxi: 'Ich habe alles, was ich zum Beweis angeführet habe, selbst und vielmal gesehen und betrachten können, sowhohl Gemälde und Statuen, als Geschnittene Steine und Münzen; um aber der Vorstellung des Lesers zu Hülfe zu kommen, habe ich sowohl Steine, als Münzen, welche erträglich in Kupfer gestochen sind, aus Büchern zugleich mit angeführet'. Quotations here are given from this edition, and not the second, posthumous, edition, except where specified. All translations are from Johann Joachim Winckelmann, *History of the Art of Antiquity*, Harry Francis Mallgrave, trans. Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Trust, 2006, 76. Other translations from French, German, or Latin are by the author. Many thanks, for their comments on a draft, to François de Callataÿ and Bernhard Woytek. Thanks also to Jonathan Williams, the editors Amy Smith and Fiona Gatty, and the *JAH* reviewer for their helpful comments. See also the article by Amy Smith in this volume, for the context of other objects, in which coins were situated. ² François de Callataÿ, 'Winckelmann et les monnaies antiques', *Revue des Etudes Grecques* 120, 2007, 553-601. edition of his letters.³ His article has been used extensively here, especially in part I. Coins also feature in Winckelmann's other works, and they start to appear in some of his earliest publications: he talks about coins and their artistic qualities in 1755 and 1756,⁴ and frequently cites them from 1756.⁵ His view of the perfection of the art of Syracusan coins first appears in 1759, when he wrote that 'these coins surpass anything the human mind can conceive of'.⁶



Figure 1 Engraving of a silver tetradrachm of the Macedonian king Antigonos Doson. Johann Joachim Winckelmann, *Anmerkungen über die Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums*, 1767, title page. Such coins are about 30mm in diameter. Photo: author.

³ Winckelmann, *History*; Giovanni Winckelmann, *Monumenti Antichi Inediti*. Rome, 1767;
³ Johann Joachim Winckelmann, ed. Walther Rehm, *Briefe*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1952–1957.
⁴ Johann Joachim Winckelmann, *Gedancken über die Nachahmung der Griechischen Wercke in der Mahlerey und Bildhauer-Kunst*. Friedrichstadt: Hagenmüller, 1755; and Johann Joachim Winckelmann, *Sendschreiben über die Gedanken Von der Nachahmung der griechischen Werke in der Malerey und Bildhauerkunst*. Dresden and Leipzig: Walther, 1756. For the texts see Johann Joachim Winckelmann, ed. Adolf Borbein, Max Kunze and Axel Rügler, *Dresdner Schriften*. *Text und Kommentar*. Mainz: von Zabern, 2016, 51-77 and 79-104.

⁵ Many coins are cited in *Erläuterungen der Gedanken von der Nachahmung der griechischen Werke in der Malerey und Bildhauerkunst.* Dresden and Leipzig: Walther, 1756; and in *Beantwortung des Sendschreibens über diese Gedanken.* Dresden and Leipzig: Walther, 1756. For the texts see Winckelmann, ed. Borbein, Kunze and Rügler, Walther Rehm, *Dresdner Schriften*, 113-153.

⁶ 'weiter als diese [Syracusischen] Münzen kann der menschliche Begriff nicht gehen': J.J. Winckelmann, 'Erinnerung über die Betrachtung der Werke der Kunst'. Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften und der freien Künste, 5. Leipzig: 1759, 1-13, at 10 = Johann Joachim Winckelmann, ed. Walter Rehm, Kleine Schriften. Vorreden. Entwurfe. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002, 149-56, at 154 (a new text is promised in Johann Joachim Winckelmann, ed. Adolf Borbein, Max Kunze and Axel Rügler, Römische Schriften. Text und Kommentar. Mainz: von Zabern, forthcoming 2021.) This was also the time that Winckelmann hoped to become the curator of coins and antiguities at Dresden, after the death of the previous incumbent, Johann Gottfried Richter (1713-58). He says in a letter to Philipp von Stosch, 5 August 1758: 'It seems that I might soon be called back, especially since the Antiquarian and Overseer of the coin cabinet of the Prince of Chur prince died: I am now sending the Prince a written essay in Italy every week about matters concerning antiquities. I am anxiously waiting for the reply ...' ('Es scheinet dass ich möchte bald zurück gerufen werden, zumahl da der Antiquarius und Aufseher des Münz-Cabinets des Chur-Prinzen gestorben: ich schicke dem Prinzen itzo alle Woche einem schriftlichen Aufsatz im Ital. von Sachen welche die Alterthümer betreffen. Ich warte mit Schmerzen auf Antwort ...'): Winckelmann, Briefe I, 402, Letter 227. There was no reply.

Winckelmann's knowledge of coins

There is no doubt that coins were important to Winckelmann himself. His love of them even contributed to his own death, since he was murdered in Trieste, when he foolishly showed off some medals he had been given by the Empress Maria Theresa in Vienna.⁷ He had his own collection, and we can see the pride he took in it from the way he chose to illustrate a specimen from it, 'ex Musaeo Auctoris' on the title page of his 1767 Anmerkungen über die Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums (fig. 1). This silver coin in the name of a Macedonian king called Antigonos⁸ was engraved again for the plates of the *Monumenti*, which was published in the same year.⁹ It is the sort of coin that he would have admired greatly, not just because it was very rare, but also because it was very like the contemporaneous coins of Demetrios and Pyrrhos, which he regarded as the most beautiful coins from antiquity: 'From this king's reign [Demetrios Poliorketes] and from that of Pyrrhus [of Epiros], we find the most beautifully minted coins'.¹⁰ He was explicit in the 1776 second edition of the Geschichte: 'this coin, the size of the copper engraving which represents it, is of a very sublime striking, and one of the most beautiful Greek coins ...'.¹¹ It was one of his prize possessions, but, as discussed below and as shown by its aberrant designs and wrong weight standard, it was not a genuine ancient coin.

In the *Geschichte* another coin, an archaic coin of Syracuse, was also illustrated as coming 'from the author's collection' (fig. 2).¹² Aside from these two

⁷ Alex Potts, 'Introduction' in Winckelmann, *History*, Mallgrave, trans. 15-16; de Callataÿ, 'Winckelmann et les monnaies antiques', 554-55.

⁸ Winckelmann (see next note) attributed it to Antigonos 'Soter' (*recte* Monophthalmos), but nowadays similar pieces are generally attributed to his later homonym, Antigonos Doson, King of Macedonia (229-211 BC): see Katerina Panagopoulou, *The Early Antigonids. Coinage*, *Money, and the Economy*, New York: American Numismatic Society, 2019.

⁹ Winckelmann, Monumenti Antichi, I, pl. 41; 2.47-49, no. 41.

¹⁰ 'Von diesem und dem Könige Pyrrhus, finden sich Münzen von dem allerschönsten Gepräge'. Winckelmann, *History*, 355, Mallgrave, trans. 316. We may note that this idea seems to sit oddly with the coin's late date, well after the periods of great – in his view – Greek art in the fifth and fourth centuries: but, see below.

¹¹ Johann Joachim Winckelmann, *Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums*, second ed. Vienna: Akademischer Verlag, 1776, 717: 'Diese Münze in der Größe des Kupfers, welches dieselbe vorstellet, ist von einem sehr erhabenen Gepräge, und als eine der schönsten griechischen Münzen ...'; cf. 277: 'on a beautiful coin of King Antigonos I' ('auf einer schönen Münze Königs Antigonos des ersten').

¹² The coin is engraved on Winckelmann, *History*, 213, and the description is taken from the list of illustrations, li, no. 17, Mallgrave, trans. 83: 'At the beginning of the third section of this fourth chapter are shown two of the oldest silver coins from Syracuse, of which one is in the Stosch *museo* and the other is owned by the author' ('Zu Anfang des Dritten Stücks dieses Vierten Capitels, stehen zwo der ältesten Syracusischen Münzen in Silber, von denen die eine in dem Stossischen Museo war; die andere besitzet der Verfasser'). Johann Joachim Winckelmann, Adolf Borbein *et al.* (ed.), *Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums. Allgemeiner Kommentar*. Mainz: von Zabern, 2007, 61, for the background to the engraving.

Andrew Burnett



Figure 2 Engraving showing silver coins of Syracuse. Johann Joachim Winckelmann, *Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums*, 1764, 213. The original coins would be about 23mm in diameter. Photo: author.

illustrations, however, we have no information about his collection, but we can probably conclude that it was not very large. Certainly, for most of his life it seems unlikely that Winckelmann had the necessary wealth to buy many pieces,¹³ since Macedonian and Syracusan coins of the sort just mentioned would not have been cheap, in both Germany and Italy.¹⁴ It is therefore apparent that he went to other collections elsewhere and to books for information.¹⁵

Although the majority of his citations were unreferenced, Winckelmann did name some other collections from time to time, for example the Casanova collection in Rome, the Farnese collection in Naples, other collections in Naples and Florence collections, the imperial collection in Vienna and, above all, the Stosch collection,¹⁶

¹³ Katherine Harloe, *Winckelmann and the Invention of Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013, 44-48, on his poverty, or at least modest lifestyle; cf. Potts, 'Introduction', 8-10. Stefano Ferrari in *J.J. Winckelmann (1717-1768). Monumenti antichi inediti. Storia di un'opera illustrata. History of an Illustrated Work*. Stefano Ferrari and Nicoletta Ossanna Cavadini, eds. Milan: Skira, 2017, 23, however, points out that he paid 10,000 ducats for the *Monumenti* ('a spese d'autore', as is stated on its title page).

¹⁴ Such coins fetch several thousand dollars each today, as can be seen from the prices realised in coinarchives.com.

¹⁵ An engraved plate for a third coin illustration survives today in the Naples Museum, among the Winckelmann material: see Ferrari and Ossanna Cavadini, J.J. Winckelmann, 313, 335. It is an engraving of a Roman coin of the emperor Septimius Severus, from the city of Perinthos in Thrace. There is no indication of ownership, but in fact the coin was in the collection of the great French collector Joseph Pellerin (1684–1782), whose collection was later (in 1776) acquired by the French king, and it remains today in the Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris: Joseph Pellerin, Mélange de diverses médailles I, Paris: Delatour, 1765, 74-76 (with engraving) = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, FG 1129 = Edith Schönert-Geiss, Griechisches Münzwerk: die Münzprägung von Perinthos, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 182-83, no. 520 (specimen 2). The engraving was made by copying the engraving published in Pellerin's book. The Winckelmann engraving is very similar to that in Pellerin, which is a much 'improved' version of the original, as a comparison with the coin itself shows. The Naples plate is signed 'Aloja' and has been dated to the '19th century first two decades', being attributed to the engraver Raffaele Aloja. Presumably it was made for the new edition (Rome: Mordacchini) of the Monumenti published in 1820 (vols 1–2) and 1823 (vol 3, with material by Stefano Raffei). For the history of the nineteenth-century Italian editions, see Ferrari in Ferrari and Ossanna Cavadini, J.J. Winckelmann, 41-49. ¹⁶ De Callataÿ, 'Winckelmann et les monnaies antiques', 562-64.

which he would have known well from the time during which he had spent cataloguing the Stosch gems.¹⁷ Philipp von Stosch (1691-1757) was the original owner of a second coin of Syracuse that Winckelmann illustrated in the *Geschichte*.¹⁸ The collection of Giovanni Battista Casanova (1730-95), brother of the more famous Giacomo, must also have been an important source for him. The two men cooperated closely at first, Casanova being responsible for many of the engravings in the *Monumenti*. One of the two coin illustrations in *Abhandlung von der Fähigkeit* of 1763, a coin of Gela, was taken from the Casanova collection.¹⁹

The breadth of Winckelmann's knowledge of the numismatic literature, which was very impressive, has also been analysed by de Callataÿ.²⁰ Winckelmann had clearly read widely in this area of study, as he had in other fields.²¹ Among the books he frequently cites are some of the older classics like the works of Hubertus Goltzius and Jean Tristan, as well as more modern works of his own time, such as those of Jean Foy-Vaillant, Ezekiel Spanheim, Lorenz Beger, Jean Hardouin, Sigebert Havercamp and Joseph Pellerin.²² The result of this was a very extensive citation of coins in his writings. Coins from all over the ancient world – Spain, Italy and Etruria, Sicily (including Syracuse), Macedonia, Malta, Asia Minor, Cyrene, Phoenicia, Syria, and Persia – were referenced.²³ He often came back to the coins of Sicily, especially those of Syracuse, which were the only coins to be illustrated in the

¹⁷ J.J. Winckelmann, *Description des pierres gravées du feu baron de Stosch*. Florence: Bonducci, 1760. On Stosch and Winckelmann, see the introductory remarks by Axel Rügler, in Johann Joachim Winckelmann, ed. Adolf Borbein, Max Kunze and Axel Rügler, *Description des pierres gravées du feu baron de Stosch*. Mainz: von Zabern, xi-xxvi; and M. Kunze, 'Winckelmann e le gemme etrusche della Collezione Philipp von Stosch', in *Winckelmann, Firenze e gli Etruschi. Il padre dell'archeologia in Toscana. Catalogo della mostra (Firenze, 26 maggio* 2016–30 gennaio 2017). Florence: Edizioni ETS, 2016, 157-75. For Stosch's coin collection, see note 45.

¹⁸ See note 12.

¹⁹ *Abhandlung*, [3]: 'Ex Mus. Io. Casanovae Pict'. ('from the *museo* of Giovanni Casanova the painter'). Might Casanova also have been the owner of the rare decadrachm of Syracuse, engraved on the title page of the *Abhandlung*? Winckelmann does not give a source. On Casanova, see M. Kunze (ed.), *Die Casanovas. Beiträge zu Giacomo, Francesco und Giovanni Battista Casanova sowie Silvio della Valle di Casanova*. Stendal: Schriften der Winckelmann-Gesellschaft XVII, 2000.

²⁰ See also the numismatic books included list of works given by Potts, 'Introduction', 373-414.

²¹ Harloe, Winckelmann and the Invention of Antiquity, 53-60.

²² De Callataÿ, 'Winckelmann et les monnaies antiques', 560-62. There are some obvious omissions, however, such as Charles Patin or Francesco Mezzabarba, as can be seen from a comparison with the comprehensive review of the literature given by Johann Heinrich Schulze at Halle in 1738, and published posthumously by his son: Johann Heinrich Schulze, ed. Johann Ludwig Schulze, *Anleitung zur ältern Münzwisssenschaft, worin die dazu gehörigen Schriften beurtheilet, und die Alterthümer aus Münzen erleutert werden*. Halle: Waisenhaus, 1766, 6-32. On Schulze, see further below.

²³ See Johann Joachim Winckelmann, ed. Adolf H. Borbein, Thomas W. Gaehtgens, Johannes Irmscher and Max Kunze, *Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums. Katalog der antiken Denkmaler*. *Erste Auflage Dresden* 1764. *Zweite Auflage Wien* 1776. Mainz: von Zabern, 2006, 493-518, nos. 1181-1261. *Geschichte*. He cited coins of Syracuse, together with some of Metapontum in southern Italy, in one of his letters in a way that startles us today, when, as part of his view of the superiority of ancient over modern art, he asserted that no modern artist, including Raphael and Caracci, could make comparable portraits.²⁴

Although Winckelmann cited coins from all over the ancient world, and from different periods (mainly Greek and Roman), he assumed that Greek coins were the most beautiful. For example, he wrote that the coins of Syrian kings showed little art, so could not have been made by Greeks.²⁵ Perhaps somewhat surprisingly, he regarded the most beautiful of all Greek coins as those produced by Agathokles, the early Hellenistic ruler of Syracuse (317-289 BC), which he described as 'extraordinarily beautiful'.²⁶ This opinion is compatible with his view, already mentioned, that the coins of the contemporary Demetrios and Pyrrhos were 'very beautiful',²⁷ and that they followed in the footsteps of the coins of the Macedonian kings Philip II and Alexander the Great (and their successors): 'this period [that of highest art] lives on in the coins of Philip [II] of Macedon, Alexander the Great, and his immediate successors'.28 In Winckelmann's view, coins came second only to the statue of Laocoon.²⁹ At first glance, the emphasis on the artistic quality of coins of the Hellenistic period seems a bit odd to us, since it came after the great periods of the fifth and fourth century, but it caused no real chronological difficulty for a man of Winckelmann's intellect. For him one could see how 'the arts flourished in Sicily both during the greatest unrest under King Agathokles and the ongoing war he fought with the Carthaginians and during the first Punic War'; this was, he says, while 'the arts lay fallow in Greece and works of art were being maltreated'.30

As well as his knowledge of coins and appreciation of their aesthetic qualities, Winckelmann also showed an awareness of issues of chronology, very interestingly but perhaps not surprisingly so, given the historical theme of his work and the greater ease with which Hellenistic and Roman coins could be dated, compared with works of art in other media. He cited the French numismatist Jean Hardouin for the view that the gold coins of Cyrene were the oldest surviving,³¹ and Hardouin, together with Claude de Boze, for the coins of Athens, which

²⁴ J.J. Winckelmann to Graf Cobenzl [February 1768]: Rehm, *Briefe* 3, 368, no. 937a, quoted *in extenso* by de Callataÿ, 'Winckelmann et les monnaies antiques', 556-57. The same view and comparisons (without Metapontum) had been expressed in 1759, in his 'Erinnerung', 10 = Rehm, *Kleine Schriften*, 154.

- ²⁵ Winckelmann, *History*, 374-6; Mallgrave, trans. 325-26.
- ²⁶ Winckelmann, *History*, 366: 'ausserordentlich schönen'; Mallgrave, trans. 322.
- ²⁷ Winckelmann, *History*, 355: 'die allerschönsten'; Mallgrave, trans. 316.
- ²⁸ Winckelmann, *History*, 350: 'ausser diesem schönsten und grossen Werke der höchsten Zeit der Kunst, lebet dieselbe in den Münzen Königs von Macedonien, Alexandrers des Grossen, und dessen Nachfolger'; Mallgrave, trans. 314.
- ²⁹ Winckelmann, *History*, 347-50; Mallgrave, trans. 313-14.
- ³⁰ Winckelmann, *History*, 366: 'blüheten dieselben [die Künste] in Sicilien auch in den größten Unruhen unter dem Könige Agathocles, und im währenden Kriege desselben mit den Carthaginensern und im ersten Punischen Kriege ... die Künste in Griechenland lagen, und die Werke derselben gemishandelt wurden'; Mallgrave, trans. 322.
- ³¹ Winckelmann, *History*, 323; Mallgrave, trans. 302.

Winckelmann argued were older than they had thought.³² He showed his own good understanding of coins and their chronology when he departed from books and offered his own observations. He pointed out that the coins of Sybaris in southern Italy must have been made before the destruction of that city in 510 BC, an argument still used by scholars today in dating the earliest phases of Greek coinage.³³ When he discussed early Greek coins, he noted that some of them had retrograde inscriptions, which he rightly regarded a sign of an early date.³⁴ He seems very alert to the importance of epigraphy, citing for instance the rounded form of the gamma in the name of the city on coins of Gela. Although he wrote as early as 1758 that he was going to write what he called a 'Paleografia de Medaglie', he never did so.³⁵

It is easy to overstate Winckelmann's originality in any of these respects, as can be seen from a consideration of the work of other scholars. Jean-Jacques Barthélemy had already announced in 1750 (published in 1756) his 'Essai d'une paléographie numismatique', and coin epigraphy had been used earlier in the century by figures as diverse as Ezekiel Spanheim, Bernard Montfaucon and the Earl of Winchilsea.³⁶ Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann has also pointed out that Winckelmann may have had the opportunity to learn from the lectures given by Johann Heinrich Schulze in 1738 at Halle University, when he was a student there.³⁷ Kaufmann has observed: 'More importantly, Schulze's announcement for a seminar he offered in 1738–1739 also indicates that he was then teaching how one could

³² Winckelmann, *History*, 327; Mallgrave, trans. 304.

³³ E.g. Christopher Howgego, Ancient History from Coins. London: Routledge, 1995, 4.

³⁵ De Callataÿ, 'Winckelmann et les monnaies antiques', 574-76.

³⁶ Ezekiel Spanheim, *De praestantia et usu numismatum antiquorum*. London: Smith, 1706, 59-130; Bernard de Montfaucon, *Palaeographia Graeca*. Paris: Guerin, 1708, 3, 118, 125, 142, 143, 152, 153, 197, 268, 286, 338; Earl of Winchilsea, in Nicola Haym, *Il Tesoro Britannico*. London, 1719, 1.75-106 (English) and 151-203 (Italian translation). Haym's book, and Winchilsea's contribution, were known to Schulze: *Anleitung*, 25-26.

³⁷ Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, 'Antiquarianism, the History of Objects, and the History of Art before Winckelmann', Journal of the History of Ideas 62: 3, July 2001, 523-41, at 537; cf. Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, 'Before Winckelmann: Toward the Origins of the Historiography of Art', in Knowledge, Science, and Literature in Early Modern Germany. Gerhild Scholz Williams and Stephan K. Schindler, eds. Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1996, 71-89, at 80-81. Kaufmann says that, although Rehm, Briefe IV (1957), 376, 565 n. 214, shows that Winckelmann attended lectures by Schulze, we do not know if he also attended Schulze's numismatic course at his private college. This is, however, sometimes said to have been the case: e.g., Herbert Koch, 'Aus der Geschichte des Robertinum. I. Numophylacium Schulzianum', in 250 Jahre Universität Halle. Streifzuge durch ihre Geschichte im Forschung und Lehre. Halle: Max Niemayer, 1944, 244-47, at 244: 'unter seinen Hörern war auch Johann Joachim Winckelmann...'. Koch was, in turn, cited as definite evidence by Carl Justi, Winckelmann und seine Zeitgenossen. Leipzig: Vogel, 1898, 1.67: 'Hier konnte Winckelmann, dem der Besuch dieser Vorlesung bezeugt ist …'. Similarly, Klaus-Werner Haupt, 'Studienzeit in Halle (Saale) und Jena', in Matin Disselkamp and Fausto Testa, Winckelmann-Handbuch: Leben, Werk, Wirkung, Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 2017, 6-9, at 8, states that 'Bereits in Sommersemester 1738 folgte W. einer Einladung zu Schulzes "Collegio private über die Müntz-Wissenschaft"'.

³⁴ Winckelmann, *History*, 214-17; Mallgrave, trans. 227-29.

learn by experience to situate objects, namely, coins, in history according to the way they look, dating them not merely according to what they depict, or their inscriptions'.³⁸ One should not, however, exaggerate the similarities between the methods of Schulze and Winckelmann. Schulze was using coins to throw light on ancient history and culture, especially religion, rather than trying to construct a history of art or coinage from them. Schulze's influence can be seen in the essay written a few years later by his disciple Michael Agnethler on the coinage of Syracuse.³⁹ Agnethler concentrated on the rulers of the city and their coins, but did not consider their artistic qualities, as Winckelmann would do.

A second opportunity to study coins would have been provided by Winckelmann's employment at Nöthnitz as secretary and librarian to the German statesman and historian, Heinrich, Graf von Bünau (1687-1762). Winckelmann held the position for six years, from 1748 to 1754. Bünau's massive library, of over 40,000 volumes, was catalogued at the time in great detail, and one part of the catalogue was devoted to 'Scriptores Numismatici'.⁴⁰ It is a very extensive list of books, well organised by different categories, covering some 70 pages, listing all the numismatic books that Winckelmann would later cite in his writings.

De Callataÿ has also explored the relationship of Winckelmann's ideas about coins with those of a little-known Bolognese scholar, Giovanni Battista Bianconi.⁴¹ Bianconi was the uncle of Winckelmann's friend Giovanni Ludovico Bianconi. The uncle published a little book on the beauty of Sicilian coins in 1763, a few months before Winckelmann published his *Geschichte* (1764), but he had worked on coins for many years. They first met in 1755 and it seems likely that his views influenced Winckelmann.⁴² De Callataÿ pointed out that previous books had little to say on the

³⁸ Johann Heinrich Schulze, *Einladungs-Schrift zu einem Collegio Privato über die Müntz-Wissenschaft und die daraus zu erläuternde Griechische und Römische Alterthümer*. Halle: 1738.
Schulze's lectures were posthumously published by his son: Johann Heinrich Schulze, ed. Johann Ludwig Schulze, *Anleitung zur ältern Münzwissenschaft, worin die dazu gehörigen Schriften beurtheilet, und die Alterthümer aus Münzen erleutert werden*, Halle: Waisenhaus, 1766. His collection, the 'Numophylacium Schulzianum', was catalogued by his disciple Michael Gottlieb Agnethler, *Numophylacium Schulzianum*. Leipzig: 1746, and *Beschreibung des Schulzischen Münzkabinet*. Halle: Johann Justus Gebauer, 1750–1752. It is still preserved in the Archaeological Museum of the Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg.
³⁹ Michael Gottlieb Agnethler, 'Syracusanische Könige und Tyrannen aus griechischen Münzen', in Siegmund Jacob Baumgarten, *Samlung von Erleuterungsschriften und Bausätzen zur algemeinen Welthistorie* part III. Halle: 1750, 298-398. Schulze is mentioned several times by Agnethler, who clearly thought very highly of his numismatic teaching.
⁴⁰ Johann Michael Francke, *Catalogus Bibliothecae Bunavianae*. Vol. II, Pars III Liber VIII. Leipzig: 1753, 569-638.

⁴¹ François de Callataÿ, 'La beauté des monnayages grecs de Sicile: une investigation sur la genèse d'un sentiment (*regressio ad Winckelmannum* ... et Giovanni Battista Bianconi)', in *Nomismata. Studi di numismatica offerti ad Aldina Cutroni Tusa per il suo novantatreesimo* compleanno, Lavinia Sole and Sebastiano Tusa, eds. Ragusa: Edizioni di storia e studi sociali, 2016, 42-76; F. de Callataÿ, 'Giovanni Battista Bianconi, Une source majeure et non reconnue pour la *Geschichte* de Johann Joachim Winckelmann', *CRAI* 2017, I (janvier-mars), 241-65. ⁴² De Callataÿ, 'Giovanni Battista Bianconi', 264, says that Winckelmann refers once to Bianconi, but in fact the reference appears only in one of the later French translations, where

artistic quality of ancient, and specifically, Syracusan coins.⁴³ No doubt fired up by Bianconi's enthusiasm for the coins of Syracuse, Winckelmann would have taken delight in the beautiful coins of Sicily in the Stosch collection,⁴⁴ where he would have admired them in 1758-59, while working on the catalogue of the Stosch gems.⁴⁵

Schulze (1687-1744) had also spoken on how to distinguish genuine from fake coins,⁴⁶ and the Bünau library had a special section devoted to 'Authors on the art of explaining ancient coins and of telling the true from the false'.⁴⁷ This brings us back to Winckelmann's coin of Antigonos, which was, as already mentioned, not a genuine ancient piece. His discussion of the coin in the *Monumenti inediti* occupies some two pages, and it is his only extended discussion of a coin.⁴⁸ It is useful, however, because it illustrates the strengths and weaknesses of his use of them. At

⁴³ In addition to the books cited by de Callataÿ, mention can be made of the very influential Spanheim, *De praestantia*. Spanheim did not write about the art or style of coins. Joseph Addison had obviously felt that Spanheim had neglected the more literary value of coins, when he penned his *Dialogues upon the usefulness of ancient medals: Especially in relation to the Latin and Greek poets*. London, 1721, 1726, but no one had engaged with the aesthetics of coins.

⁴⁴ Winckelmann, *History*, 216; Mallgrave, trans. 218: 'That the concepts of beauty ... among Greek artists were not primarily inherent in art, as is the gold growing in Peru, is shown in particular by Sicilian coins, which in later times surpassed all others in beauty. I base my view on rare coins in the Stosch *museo* from Leontinoi, Messina, Segesta and Syracuse' ('Daß die Begriffe der Schönheit ... den Griechischen Künstlern nicht, wie das Gold in Peru wächst, ursprünglich mit der Kunst eigen gewesen, bezeugen sonderlich die Sicilianischen Münzen, welche in folgenden Zeiten alle andere an Schönheit übertroffen. Ich urtheile nach seltenen Münzen von Leontium, Messina, Segesta und Syracus, in dem Stoßischen Museo').

⁴⁵ Little is known about Stosch's collection, but there is an overview by Anonymous (presumably Philipp von Stosch), 'Fortsetzung der Geschichte des Freyherrn Philipp von Stosch zu Florenz', *Das Neue Gelehrte Europa* 10, 1757, 257-301, at 260-64 (thanks to Ulf Hansson for the reference). Coins of Sicily and Magna Graecia are mentioned in separate categories there, as if they formed a special part of the collection. For Stosch in general, and his collection and work on gems, see note 17.

⁴⁶ Schulze, Anleitung, 37-38.

⁴⁷ Francke, *Catalogus*, 574: scriptores de arte explicandi nummos veteres, veros a falsis discernendi cet'.

⁴⁸ Winckelmann, *Monumenti Antichi* 2.47-49. A genuine coin of Antigonos is described and illustrated (no source given) in *J.J. Winckelmann, Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums. Katalog der antiken Denkmaler. Erste Auflage Dresden* 1764. *Zweite Auflage Wien* 1776, Adolf H. Borbein, Thomas W. Gaehtgens, Johannes Irmscher, and Max Kunze, eds. Mainz: von Zabern, 2006, 497, no. 1193. The same illustration is used in *J.J. Winckelmann, Monumenti antichi inediti spiegati ed illustrati Roma* 1767. *Text*, Adolf H. Borbein and Max Kunze, eds. Mainz: de Gruyter, 2011, 293, and image 41. In *J.J. Winckelmann, Monumenti antichi*, Adolf von Borbein, Max Kunze, and Axel Rügler, eds. Mainz: de Gruyter, 2011, 208, no. 41, the coin in Winckelmann's text is rather strangely described as 'gefälschte Silber-Münze, Paris, Cabinet des Médailles, ehemals Rom, Sammlung Winckelmann, nach dem Vorbild eines antiken Münztypus (*GK Denkmäler* 1193; hier noch nicht als Fälschung erkannt)'. On the same page of the *Kommentar* (208) the illustration from Froelich's book is reproduced.

it was added by an editor. The original passage, which first occurs in the second 1776 edition of the *Geschichte* (733), does not mention Bianconi.

first sight, the engravings that appear in both the *Monumenti* and the *Geschichte* (fig. 1) look good, with, for example, the hair of the deity on the obverse nicely rendered. Unluckily for Winckelmann, however, the coin was a modern fake (figs 3 and 4), as is shown by its unusual style and iconography and by its wrong weight, and it therefore recalls the story of Winckelmann being duped by a wall painting in the Pompeian style made by Casanova, which Winckelmann had published in the *Geschichte*.⁴⁹ We do not know the origin of the fake coin, which seems to go back to near the beginning of the eighteenth century, even though no one at the time recognised the forgery as such.⁵⁰



Figure 3 Forgery of a tetradrachm of Antigonus Doson. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Cabinet des Médailles, AA.GR.358. Silver, Diam 30mm.



Figure 4 Forgery of a silver coin of Antigonus Doson. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Cabinet des Médailles, AA.GR.362. Diam 30mm.

Let us assume for the moment that it was genuine, so that we can analyse Winckelmann's discussion of it and thereby characterise his approach to coins in detail. He starts by saying that it is very rare, in his collection, and – as far as he knows – unpublished. He goes on to compare it with a similar coin published and discussed by Erasmus Froelich in his *Annales Regum et Rerum Syriae* (Tab. II, no. 1:

⁴⁹ Thomas Pelzel, 'Winckelmann, Mengs and Casanova: A Reappraisal of a Famous
Eighteenth-Century Forgery', *The Art Bulletin* 54: 3, 1972, 300-15; Potts, 'Introduction', 10-11;
Ferrari in Ferrari and Ossanna Cavadini, *J.J. Winckelmann*, 5.
⁵⁰ See below, for dating it to before the 1720s. Eckhel accepted it as genuine (see below).



Figure 5 Engraving of a silver tetradrachm of the Macedonian king Antigonos Doson. Erasmus Froelich, *Annales compendiarii regum, et rerum Syriae nummis veteribus illustrati*, 1754, Tab. II.4. The original coin would have been about 30mm in diameter. Photo: author.

here fig. 5: for an original, genuine specimen, see fig. 6).⁵¹ Winckelmann, however, criticises the engraving in Froelich's book, and suggests that Froelich's engraving was based on a corroded coin, since the composition of the wreath worn by the deity was, he says, wrongly described by Froelich as being made of reeds, enabling Froelich to identify the head as that of Neptune/Poseidon. This cannot be right, Winckelmann thinks, because Neptune is never shown in this way. Winckelmann says that his coin, in contrast, is of the finest conservation ('conservatissima'), and shows that the wreath is one of ivy, which one might think made it a head of Silenus; but he points out that it does not have Silenus's features, like his elongated ears. In the course of a very learned following paragraph, in which he cites Pindar, Callimachus and Philodemus, Winckelmann implausibly ends up with an identification of the head on his coin as that of Pan, claiming it is like the Pan on a coin of Gallienus, which he says was described by Jean Tristan.⁵²



Figure 6 Silver tetradrachm of the Macedonian king Antigonos Doson, of the same variety as that engraved by Erasmus Froelich (figure 5). Gemini Auction XIII, 2017, lot 3. Diam 30mm.

⁵¹ Erasmus Froelich, Annales compendiarii regum, et rerum Syriae nummis veteribus illustrate.
 ⁵² Jean Tristan, Commentaires Historiques. Paris: Hure and Leonard, 1644, 3.83

Winckelmann was right to point out that his coin differed from that engraved by Froelich, but Froelich had, in fact, accurately illustrated a genuine coin, not one whose appearance was altered by corrosion, and Froelich had also correctly represented the strange wreath that appears on genuine coins.⁵³ Although no coin exactly like Winckelmann's is extant today, some forgeries in the Cabinet des Médailles of the Bibliothèque nationale de France give an idea of what he must have had. One (fig. 4) has an exactly similar head (with an ivy wreath), and two others have an identical reverse, where the seated god is accompanied by a trident and dolphin (fig. 5).⁵⁴

Even if Winckelmann had accepted the authenticity of an ivy wreath, he would have known perfectly well that such a wreath would properly be a symbol of Bacchus/Dionysus, as indeed he mentions. He was, however, drawn strongly by the idea that the victory at the Battle of Marathon had been attributed to Pan, however, and he wanted the 'facts' to fit his theory, namely that the coin was struck to celebrate a (naval) victory of Antigonos; if Pan had been responsible for the victory of the Greeks at Marathon, he could also be responsible for that of Antogonos.

Winckelmann was correct in identifying the seated figure on the reverse as Apollo, but his criticism of Froelich for identifying it as Venus is exaggerated. If we look at what Froelich actually says, we can see that although he allows the possibility that it might be 'Venus armata', Froelich's first thought was indeed that the figure represents Apollo (which it does). Winckelmann also misattributed the coin in Tristan to Gallienus; although Tristan included the engraving a chapter about Gallienus,⁵⁵ it was a coin of Panticapaeum, cited there as part of a discussion of the representation of griffins on coins. This should sound a warning about Winckelmann's carelessness, his over-enthusiastic interpretations and particularly his claim to have carefully looked at original art objects to 'discover the truth'. His

 ⁵³ Modern commentators generally refer to it as a crown of seaweed, signifying Poseidon.
 ⁵⁴ Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, AA.GR.358 (24.48g: here, figure 3): https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b10316577s; AA.GR.361 (26.07g) and AA.GR.362 (20.36g:

here, figure 4) (both with a laurel wreath on the obverse):

https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b10316581h and

https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b103165802. AA.GR.362 was acquired by the royal collection in 1747, by Barthélemy, who obviously thought it was genuine (see de Callataÿ, 'La beauté des monnayages grecs de Sicile', 67, note 39). Unfortunately, any information about the origins of AA.GR.358 is not currently available, since it would be written on the ticket underneath the coin, which cannot be accessed until the current building works at the Bibliothèque nationale are completed, perhaps in 2022. AA.GR.358 certainly antedates Winckelmann, since another specimen was published in the Pembroke collection in 1746: Earl of Pembroke, Numismata antiqua in tres partes divisa. Collegit olim aeri incidi vivens curavit Thomas Pembrochiae et Montis Gomerici Comes. London, 1746, P.2 T.64. The same engraving appears in some rare copies of a proof for the Pembroke catalogue (one copy in British Museum, Department of Coins and Medals, P.2 T.61), dating to the 1720s, which is therefore the *taq* for the forgery. The second piece was later sold in the Pembroke sale as being from an 'old false die': Catalogue of the Entire Pembroke Collection of Greek, Roman, English, Scotch, Irish and Foreign Mediaeval Coins and Medals. Sotheby, 31 July, 1848, lot 777 (part), where the weight is given as 356 4/10 grains = 23.09g. The forgeries are all much too heavy, since genuine coins weigh about 17g.

⁵⁵ Tristan, Commentaires, 3.83.

judgment was fallible; he was well-informed, but no great expert; he criticised his predecessors unfairly and adopted their views without any acknowledgement. As we shall see in part III, the eminent numismatist and Winckelmann's younger contemporary, Joseph Eckhel, was, as a result, very dismissive of Winckelmann's remarks on coins.

Winckelmann's use of coin evidence

We can therefore conclude that Winckelmann showed a wide awareness of ancient coins, but a quirky understanding of them. He frequently used his knowledge of them in the *Geschichte*, and did so in three main ways.⁵⁶ His first approach was to use them as a source of iconography. When he discussed winged deities, for example, he cited coins from the island of Malta.⁵⁷ Other examples included the thunderbolt and Vulcan,⁵⁸ the figure of Mars,⁵⁹ and his descriptions of lions on coins of Velia and horses on coins of Syracuse.⁶⁰

The second way he used coins, which is really a subset of the first, was as a point of comparison. He regularly used the designs on coins as a comparison with the designs on gems, as a glance at his catalogue of the Stosch gems shows.⁶¹ Such comparisons appeared every four or five pages, usually with a reference to one of the books already cited.⁶² Coins figure generally in his introduction when he gives a fuller discussion of a figure, e.g. a winged figure, where he also cites coins of Malta,⁶³ and here also he asserted the beauty of Greek coins, especially those from Syracuse.⁶⁴ Coins are, inevitably, the most frequently cited object in the Stosch catalogue (other than gems), since they also offered a similar range of easily accessible designs.

Winckelmann's third and most significant use of coins was to support his main discussion of the development of art, but he used them only when other evidence was lacking. Two examples of this usage, one minor and one major, will suffice. The minor example concerns Phoenicia. Because Winckelmann professed to be covering the art of the whole of the ancient world, he started in Egypt, and then next moved on to Phoenician and Persian art. He pointed out that:⁶⁵

⁵⁶ For his use of coins, see Alex Potts, *Flesh and the Ideal: Winckelmann and the Origins of Art History*. New Haven: Yale, 1994, 85-89. Potts emphasises how 'they ... played a very significant role in his detailed historical description of the beautiful style', although he went on to criticise his approach, somewhat anachronistically, on the basis of the wrong datings he assumed.

⁵⁷ Winckelmann, *History*, 71; Mallgrave, trans. 146-47.

⁵⁸ Winckelmann, *History*, 87, 97; Mallgrave, trans. 162, 166.

⁵⁹ Winckelmann, *History*, 160; Mallgrave, trans. 201.

⁶⁰ Winckelmann, *History*, 186-8; Mallgrave, trans. 214-15.

⁶¹ Winckelmann, *Description des Pierres Gravées*.

⁶² On one occasion he refers to a coin in 'notre collection' (67, no. 223), but I think this means the Stosch collection.

⁶³ Winckelmann, Description des Pierres Gravées, xviii-xix.

⁶⁴ Winckelmann, Description des Pierres Gravées, xi.

⁶⁵ Winckelmann, *History*, 69-72; Mallgrave, trans. 145-47: 'Von der Kunst dieser beyden Völker ist, außer historischen Nachrichten, und einigen allgemeinen Anzeigen nichts

We have only historical reports and some general indications as to the art of these two peoples ... There is little hope of discovering large and significant works of sculpture, from which we would have drawn more light and knowledge. But as Phoenician coins and Persian reliefs have been preserved, these two peoples could not be entirely passed over in silence in this history.

He continued to focus on the coinage of the Phoenicians, particularly the rather obscure coinages of their colonies in Malta, Spain and Sicily. He then observed the fact that only coins survived for the Phoenicians and that this imposed limitations on the understanding of their art.

The major example concerns his discussion of the first of the four main styles of art that he identified in his work which provided the structure for the proper understanding of Greek art.⁶⁶ The four styles are, of course, the 'most ancient', the 'high', the 'beautiful', and the imitative. Winckelmann produced plenty of examples for his second, third, and fourth styles of Greek art, and so he did not use coins in his initial discussion of them. But he had no other material available for the first style, which is the most ancient, and which, he said, was not yet beautiful. Thus, his discussion of this first style, which we would call Archaic, was based almost entirely on coins:⁶⁷

With regard to the more ancient style, we will first consider the outstanding monuments extant from this period, then the characteristics derived from those works, and finally the transition to the grand style. We can cite no older and more reliable monuments of the earlier style than some coins whose impression and inscriptions bear witness to their high antiquity.

He continued to make many interesting observations, such as the ones about chronology, already mentioned.

bestimmtes ... zu sagen; es ist auch wenig Hoffnung zu Entdeckungen großer und beträchtlicher Werke der Bildhauerey, aus welchen mehr Licht und Kenntniß zu schöpfen wäre. Da ich aber von den Phöniciern Münzen, und von den Persischen Künstlern erhobene Arbeiten erhalten habe, so konnten diese Völker in dieser Geschichte nicht gänzlich mit Stillschweigen übergangen werden'.

⁶⁶ See also Potts, 'Introduction', 24: 'the discussion of early Greek work in his *Geschichte* was almost all based on evidence provided by images of coins, the only antiquities surviving in large enough quantities to enable him to gain an idea of the characteristics of an archaic style'. Mathias René Hofter, *Die Sinnlichkeit des Ideals. Zur Begründung von Johann Joachim Winckelmanns Archäologie*, Ruhpolding and Mainz: Franz Philipp Rutzen, 2008, esp. 215-62, discusses Winckelmann's approach.

⁶⁷ Winckelmann, *History*, 213-14: 'Bey dem älteren Stile sind erstlich die übrig gebliebenen vorzüglichen Denkmaale in demselben, ferner die aus denselben gezogenen Eigenschaften, und endlich der Uebergang zu dem großen Stil zu betrachten. Man kann keine ältere und zuverläßigere Denkmaale des ältern Stils, als einige Münzen, anführen, von deren hohem Alter das Gepräge und ihre Inschrift Zeugniß geben'; Mallgrave, trans. 227. See also Hofter, *Sinnlichkeit*, 229-31, for the use of coins in the discussion of this style.

These examples illustrate Winckelmann's method of working – he preferred to use art forms other than coins, and generally ignored them for his most substantive analyses, unless he was driven into using them by a lack of other evidence. Thus, they played only a secondary role in his study, despite his wide knowledge and love of them.

There are other examples of the lower epistemological status he accorded to coins. The most obvious is in his use of illustration. As is well known, the *Geschichte* is not much illustrated, and has only 24 engravings; nevertheless, only one is of a coin. The same pattern is found, *a fortiori*, in the more fully illustrated *Monumenti antichi inediti*: it has 208 plates, but again only one is of a coin (Winckelmann's own coin of Antigonos). This lack of illustration of coins can be contrasted with Winckelmann's admiration for one of the other 'minor arts', that of glyptics. Not only is the image on the title page of the *Geschichte* a gem, but no fewer than ten of the twenty-four engravings are taken from gems. Gems, too, had a special section in Winckelmann's introductory essay, when he considered the different media of art objects,⁶⁸ but there was no corresponding section for coinage; and, of course, the *Monumenti* is full of gems.⁶⁹

Winckelmann's influence

The first part of this article illustrated Winckelmann's love and knowledge of coins, while part II showed how his approach to them was not very original nor always very creditable. Since coins were often present in his writings and since his writing was so enormously influential, we might expect that he would have had as transformative an effect on the study of coins, as he did on the other arts. In numismatics he is best known today for emphasising the beauty of Syracusan coins, a judgment which has led to them being some of the most admired and collected coins ever since, even if the original inspiration of the idea came from Giovanni Battista Bianconi. The way in which he gave coins a prominent, even if less than central, role in the main discussion of ancient art, has also ensured that they have still appeared regularly in modern books on ancient art, even if they generally have less prominence than he gave them.⁷⁰

There are, then, pluses and minuses. In the last part of this article, I would like to examine Winckelmann's greatest, if unacknowledged legacy to numismatics; the way that he shaped the overall structure, or indeed system or 'Lehrgebäude', which dominated the study of ancient coins for the following two centuries. I will be necessarily selective and focus on the two figures who were the most influential in the field of Greek numismatics after Winckelmann was writing: Joseph Hilarius von

⁶⁸ Winckelmann, *History*, 7; Mallgrave, trans. 117.

⁶⁹ Cf. de Callataÿ, 'Winckelmann et les monnaies antiques', 577.

⁷⁰ For example, in the standard handbook of Greek art of the later twentieth century, they appear in Chapter 8, after the more monumental arts, but before jewellery, painting, pottery and furniture: Gisela Richter, *A Handbook of Greek Art: A Survey of the Visual Arts of Ancient Greece.* London: Phaidon, 1959 (and many later editions), 243-50.

Eckhel in late eighteenth-century Vienna and Barclay Head in late nineteenth-century London.⁷¹

Joseph Hilarius Eckhel

Joseph Hilarius Eckhel (1737–1798) was keeper of the imperial coin cabinet in Vienna and his great work, the *Doctrina Numorum Veterum*,⁷² was enormously influential throughout the following century. Eckhel had begun work on it long before it was published in 1792-98 (at least fifteen to twenty years before). The earliest we hear of it is in the 1770s, and during that time he published several other books on ancient coins. Although he was a contemporary of Winckelmann and although Winckelmann visited Vienna and the imperial coin cabinet there, it seems that the two men never actually met, but obviously Eckhel was aware of Winckelmann's work. A telling example is the way that Eckhel copied Winckelmann's metaphor of Syracusan coins being 'the Peru' of coin collectors.⁷³

In one of his earlier books, publishing his observations on some ancient coins in 1775, Eckhel had referred several times to Winckelmann's work, using it as a source for iconography.⁷⁴ He referred to Winckelmann's *Description des pierres gravées du feu Baron de Stosch* (Florence, 1760), the *Monumenti Antichi Inediti* (Rome, 1767) and the *Anmerkungen über die Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums* (Dresden, 1767). Most of the citations were neutral, but, in a further passage, he criticised Winckelmann's remarks in the *Anmerkungen*:⁷⁵

The very famous Winckelmann, known both for his learning and for his end in Trieste, made the same mistake, when in the "Observations on his history of art", written in German [*Anmerkungen über die Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums*] he has doubts as to whether porphyry occurs in Egypt.

⁷² Joseph Hilarius Eckhel, *Doctrina numorum veterum*, Vienna: Degen, 1792–1778.

⁷³ The point was made by de Callataÿ, 'La beauté des monnayages grecs de Sicile', 49; cf. 51, 56. Winckelmann, *History*, 216; Mallgrave, trans. 228: 'That the concepts of beauty ... among Greek artists were not primevally inherent in art, as is the gold growing in Peru ...' ('Daß die Begriffe der Schönheit ... den Griechischen Künstlern nicht, wie das Gold in Peru wächst, ursprünglich mit der Kunst eigen gewesen ...'). Joseph Eckhel, *Kurzgefasste Anfangsgründe zur alten Numismatik*. Vienna: 1786, 122: 'Syracuse, this formerly well-respected city in Sicily, which was unhesitatingly regarded as be the most magnificent of all Greek cities, is still the Peru of coin collectors' (Syrakus, diese vormals so angesehene Stadt in Sicilien, die man ohne Bedenken für die prächtigste aus allen griechischen Städten hielt, ist noch itzt das Peru der Münzensammler'). As de Callataÿ has pointed out, the same sentiment was repeated in Eckhel's *Doctrina* (1.241-42), though without the metaphor of Peru.

⁷⁴ Joseph Eckhel, *Numi veteres anecdoti*. Vienna: Kurzbock, 1775, 6-7, 8, 14, 30, 231 and 301. ⁷⁵ Eckhel, *Doctrina* 1.296: 'Ad eundem lapidem offendit celeberrimus Winckelmannus tam eruditione, quam Tergestino suo fato cognitus, qui in animadversionibus ad suam artis historiam Germanice scriptis subdubitat, an lapis porphyrites in Aegypto gignatur'. The reference is to Wickelmann, *Anmerkungen*, 16.

⁷¹ An early example of a coin catalogue written entirely under the influence of Winckelmann is Carl Adolf Gottlob von Schachmann, *Catalogue raisonné d'une collection de médailles*. Leipzig: 1774. Thanks to François de Callataÿ for the reference.

Eckhel clearly knew Winckelmann's works well, and, although Winckelmann may have been wrong on this point of detail, he was still 'known for his learning'.

Twenty years later, in the *Doctrina*, Eckhel was much more critical. In this work he hardly bothered to cite Winckelmann, and, when he did, it was to disparage him. There are two pertinent examples of this. Eckhel naturally cited Winckelmann in the discussion of the coins of Antigonos, Winckelmann's favourite piece, as discussed above. Eckhel, who normally took a strong line on authenticity, appears to have accepted the coin as genuine, but nevertheless dismissed 'the arguments which he [Winckelmann] brings', as 'either wrong or proving nothing'.⁷⁶ Elsewhere, in a discussion of Roman medallions, Eckhel stated bluntly that 'It is well enough known that, whenever Winckelmann deals with numismatics, he writes incoherently'.⁷⁷ We have seen that Eckhel's criticism of Winckelmann's discussion of the coin of Antigonos is fair enough, but his language is contemptuous, as it is in the second passage.

Eckhel may have had little time for Winckelmann's numismatics, but, in fact, he owed him a great debt, and both men shared the aim of constructing a chronological framework for the study of the history of their subjects. Both wanted to create a structure of knowledge. Winckelmann had explained in 1764 in the opening words of the *Geschichte*:⁷⁸

The history of the art of antiquity that I have endeavoured to write is no mere narrative of the chronology and alterations of art. Rather I understand the word history in the larger sense that it had in the Greek language, and my aim is to attempt a system.

The word 'Lehrgebäude' is usually translated as 'system' in English, and is by definition something 'systematic' or 'organised'. Winckelmann himself sometimes also used the word 'Systema'.⁷⁹ His term 'Lehrgebäude' in 1764 applied the

⁷⁶ Eckhel, Doctrina, 2.118: 'sed argumenta, quae adfert, aut fallunt, aut nihil probant'. ⁷⁷ Eckhel, *Doctrina*, 6.512-3: 'At vero iam satis cognita sunt Winckelmanni inconcinne scripta, quoties numismatica tractat'. Thanks to Bernhard Woytek for the reference. The context of the remark is Winckelmann's apparent condemnation of all the medals in the Vienna coin cabinet as fakes, which, as Eckhel says, was really a condemnation of all the pre-Hadrianic medals in Vienna (in which Eckhel says Winckelmann was also wrong); Eckhel also noted that Winckelmann had withdrawn the remark in his second edition. Eckhel does refer to Winckelmann in the same passage as an 'eruditus vir', not obviously with any irony. ⁷⁸ Winckelmann, *History*, Vorrede, ix : 'Die Geschichte der Kunst der Alterthums, welche ich zu schreiben unternommen habe, ist keine blose Erzählung der Zeitfolge und der Veränderungen in derselben, sondern ich nehme das Wort Geschichte in der weitern Bedeutung, welche dasselbe in der griechischen Sprache hat: und meine Absicht ist, einen Versuch eines Lehrgebäudes zu liefern'. Cf. Potts, 'Introduction', 12. ⁷⁹ For example, Winckelmann, *History*, 41 ('das Systema der alten Kunst der Aegypter'), 57 ('dem Systema der Griechischen Kunst'). Cf., tellingly, Winckelmann's letter to Heinrich Muzell-Stosch, 10 April 1761, Rehm, Briefe II, 132-4, no. 399, cited by Clare Hornsby, 'J.J. Winckelmann and the Society of Antiquaries of London: new documents', Burlington Magazine 162/1403, February, 2020, 126-35, at 129: 'der Saame zu einem neuen Systema der alten Kunst' ('the seed of a new system of ancient art').

language of architecture to an intellectual endeavour, and his is a characteristic Enlightenment project, which can be mirrored in many other fields. Common to all such endeavours were two features. One was to use real things as evidence, whether they were coins, plants, words or works of art. The second was to build these things into a structure of knowledge, rather than just to amass a number of 'facts'.

As is well known, Winckelmann divided ancient art into four main periods.⁸⁰ His first period was defined as archaic and included Egyptian, Etruscan and early Greek art (*der ältere Stil*). It was followed by two periods that represented the perfection of the arts: first, an era of Phidian austerity, the fifth century BC (*der hohe Stil*); and then a period of 'flowing beauty' which was epitomized by the work of Praxiteles (*der schöne Stil*). Finally, came an era of imitative and decadent copying of nature, the decline of the arts under Rome (*der Stil der Nachahmer*). In the second part of his work, Winckelmann followed the same basic scheme, although then he actually divided art into five periods, with slightly different divisions between them, and they were again slightly modified in the second, 1776, edition of his *Geschichte.*⁸¹

When Eckhel came to create his structure for numismatics, he could rely on no good numismatic precedent. For example, the most popular manual on coins at the beginning of the eighteenth century was that published by Louis Jobert in 1693, *La Science des Médailles*, a book reprinted and translated into other languages (including into English) many times. In a rather feeble attempt to put the coins in some sort of order, Jobert had laid out a five-fold classification, but it was not one based on chronology:⁸²

Of these several Heads are formed Five Different Orders of Medals, whereof may be composed very curious Series's.

In the first we may put the Series of Kings.

In the second that of Cities, either *Greek* or *Latin*, before or since the Foundation of the *Roman* Empire.

⁸⁰ Already explicit in 1761 in the memorandum he sent to the Society of Antiquaries of London: see Hornsby, 124: 'I must indicate here the different Ages and Styles of the Grecian Art, of which one may distinguish four. The most ancient Style, lasted till the time of Phydias; the Second, goes as far as Praxiteles, and this may be called the high Style; the third flourished till the End of the Grecian Liberty, and may be called the fair Style. The last, in which the Art expired'.

⁸¹ See, for example, the summaries given in the 'Erstes Register' of the Zweyter Theil, at the end of both the 1764 and 1776 editions. I (both editions) Von der Kunst der ältesten Zeiten bis auf den Phidias [Art of the earliest times up to Pheidias]; II (both editions) Von der Kunst von den Zeiten des Phidias bis auf Alexander den Grossen [Art from the time of Pheidias up to Alexander the Great]; III (1764) Von der Kunst nach Alexanders Zeiten, und von der Abnahme derselben [Art after Alexander's time and its waning]; (1776) Von der Kunst unter Alexander dem Grossen; IV (1764) Von der Griechischen Kunst unter den Römern und den Römischen Kaisern [Greek Art under the Romans and the Roman emperors]; (1776) Von der Kunst nach Alexanders Zeiten bis an das Ende der griechischen Freyheit; and V (1764) Fall der Kunst unter dem Septimius Severus [Fall of art under Septimius Severus]; (1776) Von der Griechischen Kunst unter der Römern.

⁸² Louis Jobert, *The Knowledge of Medals*, Robert Gale, trans. London: Rogers, 1697, 34.

In the third may be ranged the *Roman* Consular Families. In the fourth the Imperial, and all that relate to them. In the fifth the Deities, of which we may have very agreable Series's, either in simple Bust, or else in their full proportion, and cloathed with all their qualities and symbols. Some Heroes and Illustrious Persons are seen yet preserved on Medals, as *Homer*, *Pythagoras*, and certain *Greek* and *Roman* Captains, &c.

Eckhel had a very low opinion of Jobert,⁸³ and, instead, he put forward a different set of criteria for classifying coins, for which he acknowledged the work begun by Jean-Jacques Barthélemy, the Keeper of the French Royal collection in the later eighteenth century. It can easily be seen how similar the two approaches are:

Barthélemy (1750, published 1756): 84

These rules will be developed above all in the first part of this book; it is there that I will examine the general indications from which one can recognize the date of a coin, and in all the individual sections I will discuss what relates to the fabric, to the metal and to the size, to the shape of letters, and the nature of the types.

Eckhel (1792):85

a metal (e.g. bronze was normal for later coins) b inscription (e.g. the names of magistrates were often added later) c letter forms (e.g. the adoption of long vowels in Greek inscriptions was generally later) d fabric (e.g. early coins were more spherical than later ones) e style (*stilus picturae*)

⁸³ Eckhel, *Doctrina*, I, Praefatio, section III: 'Avail yourself, if you love brief maxims, of the thin commentary by Louis Jobert, called *Scientia numorum*, translated into all the languages of civilised Europe and worn out by the common hands of all; even if you committed it all to memory, I will vouch that you would be as little learned as you were just before' ('Utere, si contracta praecepta amas, tenui commentario Ludovici Joberti, qui Scientia numorum inscribitur, et in omnes cultoris Europae linguas versus omnium vulgo manibus teritur, quem si totum memoria complectare, tam parum te eruditum praestabo, quam dudum fueras').

⁸⁴ J.-J. Barthélemy, 'Essai d'une paléographie numismatique', *Mémoires … de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 24, 1756, 30-48, at 33: 'Ces règles seront sur-tout développées dans la première partie de cet ouvrage; c'est-là que j'examinerai les marques générales auxquelles on peut reconna ître le temps d'une Médaille, & que dans autant de sections particulières, je discuterai ce qui a rapport à la fabrique, au métal & à la grandeur, à la forme des lettres, et à la nature des types'. Barthélemy and his essay were known to Winckelmann: see the letter Winckelmann wrote to him, cited by de Callataÿ, 'Winckelmann et les monnaies antiques', 597 (13 September 1760).

⁸⁵ Eckhel, *Doctrina*, I, cxxxi-vii.

Although Barthélemy was concerned to establish the chronology, he did not set out a chronological framework – as far as we know, since he published only a fragment of his work. Eckhel, however, went on to use his criteria to define five periods (*epochae*), of ancient coins. The five periods are described in his chapter *On determining the age of coins*:⁸⁶

1. From the beginnings to Alexander I of Macedon (462 BC);

2. From 462 to the early years of Philip II, and lasting for about the next hundred years: 'not yet showing the refinement and charm of a more perfect nature, which afterwards the Graces would add';⁸⁷

3. From then to the overthrow of the Roman Republic (the end of the first century BC), about three centuries 'which is thought to be the golden age of Greek art';⁸⁸

4. From then to the reign of Hadrian (AD 117–38): 'yet it is generally agreed that the perfection of art was gradually beginning to decline for the worse';⁸⁹

5. From the Antonines to the reign of Gallienus (AD 253–68).

These were not recognized divisions of ancient history, but ones created by Eckhel as an overall classification for coins. They resulted from his application of the specific criteria which he combined together to characterize each of his periods and its products. However, although he makes no explicit reference to Winckelmann, these periods look very much like Winckelmann's and it seems very likely that they were derived and modified from Winckelmann's book.

The concept of rise and fall of art is embedded in the approach of both Winckelmann and Eckhel, and the mention of 'grace' is clearly derived from Winckelmann.⁹⁰ It is not difficult to see Eckhel's appreciation of the importance of style for the definition of different periods as following (or perhaps rather as adapting and supplementing) those set out by Winckelmann. Eckhel clearly owes his conceptual approach to Winckelmann's influence, even though he made no acknowledgment of such a considerable debt.

Barclay Head

In 1873, some 80 years after Eckhel's great work, the *British Museum Catalogue of Greek Coins* was launched. It was to become a series running to many volumes, and even today it is still regarded as the single most useful work of reference for Greek coins. It was inaugurated by Reginald Stuart Poole, then the Keeper of the

⁸⁹ 'Alioqui satis constat, artium perfectionem sensim in pejus prolabi coepisse'.

⁹⁰ On grace, see Thomas Franke, "Grazie' (Gratie)', in Disselkamp, Testa, *Winckelmann-Handbuch*, 184-91.

⁸⁶ 'De aetate numorum definienda': Eckhel, *Doctrina*, I, cxxxi-xxli.

⁸⁷ 'nondum tamen perfectioris naturae elegantiam et illecebras, quas subinde Charites addidere, exprimens'.

⁸⁸ 'praestantissima artis Gracea epocha'.

Museum's Department of Coins and Medals.⁹¹ The earliest volumes were by Poole, Percy Gardner (the greatest classical archaeologist in nineteenth-century Britain)⁹² and Barclay Head. The work of the early volumes was divided up between them,⁹³ but the driving force behind the series and its conceptual development was the young Barclay Head.

Head (1844-1914) had joined the Museum in 1864, straight from school (he did not go to university).⁹⁴ He was to work at the Museum for forty-two years, becoming Keeper of Coins and Medals for the last thirteen, and was rightly later described by his young contemporary, George Hill, as 'the best Greek numismatist this country has produced',⁹⁵ a judgement which is not controversial. He had spent his early years working closely on all categories of coins in the department, working on the registration (writing descriptions in the accession registers) and incorporation (integrating new coins into the main collection) of over 21,000 coins, half of them Roman provincial ones. It is likely that these also included the acquisition of the great collection of classical coins from the Duc de Blacas (1867). He recorded this activity in a letter written in 1870, which closed with the remark: 'I have also worked under Mr Poole's direction upon the Catalogue of Greek Coins, and have carried out a more accurate arrangement of certain important portions of the Greek series'.⁹⁶

⁹¹ Marjorie L. Caygill, 'Poole, (Reginald) Stuart (1832-1895)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004 (https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/22520). Poole too was interested in the art of coins, but more as a way of characterising different regions of the ancient world, rather than as defining its chronology, as can be seen from his article, Reginald S. Poole, 'On Greek Coins as illustrating Greek Art', *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1864, 236-47. His starting point was the more recent and then famous book by Karl Otfried Müller, *Handbuch der Archäologie der Kunst*, Breslau: Max and Komp, 1830.

⁹² On Percy Gardner (1846-1937), see Donna Kurtz, *The Reception of Classical Art in Britain: An Oxford story of plaster casts from the Antique*. Oxford: British Archaeological reports 308, 2000, 255-86; J. M. C. Toynbee and H. D. A. Major, revised by John Boardman, 'Gardner, Percy', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004 (https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/33328)

⁹³ The title page of the second volume, devoted to Sicily (1876), indicates that Syracuse (about 1/3 of the volume) was by Head, the 'other cities of Sicily' were by Gardner and the Siculo-Punic coins and Lipara by Poole ('the editor'). The same applies to the third volume (Thrace).

⁹⁴ George F. Hill, revised by Marjorie L. Caygill, 'Head, Barclay Vincent (1844-1914), Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

(https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/33781); Andrew Burnett, 'The Development of Numismatics in Britain during the 18th Century', in *Numismatik und Geldgeschichte im Zeitalter der Aufklärung. Beitäge zum Symposium im Residenzschloss Dresden*, 4.-9. *Mai* 2009, Heinz Winter and Bernhard Woytek, eds. *Numismatische Zeitschrift* xxx, 120-21, 2015, 29-41. N. Keith Rutter, 'Barclay Vincent Head', in *Dais Philēstephanos. Studies in Honour of Professor Staffan Fogelmark Presented on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, 12 April 2004, Pär Sandin, Marianne Wifstrand Schiebe, eds. Uppsala: Dahlia, 2004, 418–34, *Conseil International de Numismatique. Compte rendu* 60, 2013, 25-37 (online at https://www.inccin.org/assets/pdf/articles/numismates-head.pdf)

⁹⁵ George F. Hill, 'An autobiographical fragment', *The Medal*, 12, 1988, 37-48.

⁹⁶ Cited by Rutter, 'Barclay Vincent Head', 27.

Poole was an Egyptologist by training (hence the way that his catalogue of Alexandrian coins was arranged by design, and not by date). He clearly had a strong sense of making the collection public, both by the publication of the *British Museum Catalogue* and by getting parts of the collection on display, whether as electrotypes or as originals. But, if the series of the *British Museum Catalogue of Greek Coins* was inaugurated in his Keepership, and if indeed Head worked 'under Mr Poole's direction', it is not too difficult to see the inspiration of the young Head. Poole was apparently a lazy man or, as it has been put, he 'had done something to stir up [the department], though more by talking about it than by actual production'.⁹⁷ No one, however, could regard Head as idle; quite apart from his other publications like *The Coinage of Syracuse* (1874) or *Historia Numorum* (1887), he produced an astonishing eleven volumes of the British Museum Catalogue.⁹⁸

The introduction of the earliest volume (for Italy) of the series refers to the debt the series owed to Eckhel. However, apart from following his geographical arrangement, in practice there are different principles at work in Head's classification of Greek coins. These were adumbrated in the earliest volumes of the British Museum Catalogue,⁹⁹ and also in Head's 1874 study of the coins of Syracuse.¹⁰⁰ The classification evolved over the next decade. It was most fully articulated in his *Historia Numorum*, where we find that Eckhel's five periods for classifying coins had been replaced by seven:¹⁰¹

- 1. Period of Archaic Art (700–480 BC)
- 2. Period of Transitional Art (480–415 BC)
- 3. Period of Finest Art (415–336 BC)
- 4. Period of Later Fine Art (336–280 BC)
- 5. Period of Decline of Art (280–146 BC)

⁹⁷ Hill, 'An autobiographical fragment', 39. Marjorie L. Caygill, 'Head, Barclay Vincent', takes a more positive view, listing the many activities he undertook.

⁹⁸ 1873: Italy (with Reginald S. Poole and Percy Gardner); 1876: Sicily (with Reginald S. Poole and Percy Gardner); 1877: Thrace (with Percy Gardner); 1879: Macedonia; 1884: Central Greece; 1888: Attica etc.; 1889: Corinth and her colonies; 1892: Ionia; 1897: Caria; 1902: Lydia; and 1906: Phrygia.

⁹⁹ The Italy volume of 1873 has irregular sub-headings such as Archaic Style, Transitional Style or Period of Transition, Period of Finest Art (once, on 375 for Rhegium expanded as 'BC *cir.* 415-387'), and Period of Decline. See, for example, the entries for Tarentum, Metapontum, Croton or Rhegium. Other mints, e.g. Thurium, Velia, Terina or Heraclea, have no such subheadings . In the second volume, for Sicily (1876), the six main periods (there is only one period of Fine Art, later subdivided) are set out more formally in the Preface (v) and, for Syracuse, given a 'more precise method of classification according to dates' (vi), obviously Head's work. However, in the third volume, for Thrace (1877) we find something different, three periods defined in terms of before and after Alexander and 'before and during the period of Roman dominion' (Preface, v).

¹⁰⁰ Barclay V. Head, 'On the chronological sequence of the coins of Syracuse', *Numismatic Chronicle* 1874, 1-80 (also published separately).

¹⁰¹ Barclay V. Head, *Historia Numorum*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911, lxi-lxiv. A comparison with the system of 1876, given for Sicily (see last note), shows minor differences in date, but early decline (345-275 BC) has been promoted to later fine art (336-280) by 1887, and the 'decline of art' begins from that date.

- 6. Period of Continued Decline of Art (146–27 BC)
- 7. Imperial Period (27 BC–AD 268).

The system of classification – 'we may approach the study of Greek Numismatics armed with at least a general knowledge of the laws which hold good in the growth, the development, and the decay of Greek art'¹⁰² – seems to have been Head's own creation, although of course he was working under the influence of the progressive theory of art. It is an obvious conclusion that he was following, if adapting, the path set out a century earlier by Winckelmann in his *History*. The parallels are clear, even though Winckelmann had four periods and Head seven, but Head's seem merely a refinement of Winckelmann's. Curiously, however, Head never once mentioned Winckelmann by name;¹⁰³ he regarded Eckhel as his starting point,¹⁰⁴ writing, 'archaeology *as a science* can hardly be said to have existed in the last [eighteenth] century'.¹⁰⁵

A curiosity of Head's classification is that it is still one dominated by the fourth-century sculptor Praxiteles, rather than his fifth-century predecessor Phidias. This is really quite surprising for someone working in the British Museum in the late nineteenth-century, long dominated by the sensation of the Parthenon marbles, brought to Britain by Lord Elgin. First displayed in London in 1806 and in the British Museum in 1816, they were visited by 'a greater number than ever visited the British Museum since it was established'.¹⁰⁶ The sculptures were a smash hit. 'Far from being 'grand and square', according to Winckelmann's classification, the art of Pheidias appeared to take inspiration from nature'.¹⁰⁷ They were the subjects of reactions as diverse as a poem by Keats and a Parliamentary Commission. By the middle of the nineteenth century, their domination of art was more or less complete, and 'during the 1860s a new generation of painters turned to the Parthenon

¹⁰⁴ Head, *Historia Numorum*, xvi (preface to the first edition).

¹⁰⁵ Head, *Historia Numorum*, xvii.

¹⁰⁶ The observation was made by the artist Benjamin Haydon (1786-1846) in his diary for 28 May 1816, to amplify his remark that the Museum had been visited by over a thousand people in one day: John Joliffe, ed., *Neglected Genius. The diaries of Benjamin Robert Haydon 1808-46*. London: Hutchinson, 1990, 49, cited by David Wilson, *The British Museum. A History*. London: British Museum, 2002, 74.

¹⁰⁷ Ian Jenkins, Archaeologists and Aesthetes. London: British Museum Press, 1992, 24.

¹⁰² Head, *Historia Numorum*, xvii (from the first edition of 1887).

¹⁰³ The only occurrence I have come across is in Barclay V. Head, *A Guide to the Select Greek and Roman Coins of the Greeks*. London: British Museum, 1880, 51 no. 28 (a Euainetos decadrachm): 'Evaenetus, the engraver of this medallion, may be said to have attained perfection in his art. Winckelmann says of his works: 'weiter als diese Münze kann der menschliche Begriff nicht gehen''. The quotation is from Winckelmann's 'Erinnerung', 10. As discussed by Katherine Harloe, 'Winckelmann's reception in Great Britain', in Ortwin Dally, Maria Gazzetti, Arnold Nesselrath (eds.), *Johann Joachim Winckelmann (1717–1768) – ein europäisches Rezeptionsphänomen / Fenomeno europeo della ricezione (Cyriacus. Studien zur Rezeption der Antike* XV). Stendal, Winckelmann-Gesellschaft and Petersberg: Michael Imhof, 2020, 143-56, Winckelmann was not very well known in early 19th-century Britain, despite the 1850 English translation of Winckelmann's work: *The history of ancient art among the Greeks. Translated from the German by ... G. Henry Lodge*, London: John Chapman, 1850. Even then, he received an idiosyncratic reading in Britain, as she discusses.

sculptures with fresh admiration for Pheidias and the art of Periklean Athens'.¹⁰⁸ The British Museum's galleries were flooded with students wishing to draw them. This makes it all the more remarkable that a young assistant in the Department of Coins and Medals should have been so impervious to what was happening in his own institution and among his own colleagues in the Department of Antiquities.¹⁰⁹ The answer must surely be that he was heavily influenced by Winckelmann's views, although his debt in never made explicit. It may be that he was more influenced by Eckhel, and so only indirectly by Winckelmann; but if so, it is curious that he chose to ignore the other criteria set out by Eckhel.

In turn, Head's classification was enormously influential in the history of numismatics, and its codification in his own great *Historia Numorum*, both the original edition of 1887 and the revised edition of 1911, meant that it dominated the English approach to Greek numismatics for the rest of the nineteenth and for much of the twentieth century. His stylistic approach to Greek coinage survived more or less intact until Colin Kraay's *Archaic and Classical Greek Coinage* of 1976,¹¹⁰ although from the early twentieth century it had been gradually supplemented by other methods, such as die studies and the analysis of hoards.¹¹¹

Whatever one may think of the way in which the periods were divided and described, the most interesting thing about Head's classification is that it was based entirely on art. It was the artistic style of the coins that was the sole determining factor for the classification of the coins, and nothing else. We might suppose that there was no other numismatic methodology available at the time, but that is not true. Before Head was writing, the French numismatist Joseph Pellerin and others had seen the importance of hoards for the study of Greek coinage, and their method had been triumphantly applied to Roman coins by Bartolomeo Borghesi and Theodor Mommsen since 1860.¹¹² But Head ignored it and the criteria of metal, which Eckhel had used, along with inscriptions, letter forms, and fabric.¹¹³ But these

¹⁰⁸ Jenkins, Archaeologists and Aesthetes, 38.

¹⁰⁹ One recalls, coincidentally, the dislike of another numismatist, Richard Payne Knight, of the Elgin marbles half a century before, who regarded them as Roman works of the Hadrianic period: Jenkins, *Archaeologists and Aesthetes*, 24.

¹¹⁰ Colin Kraay, *Archaic and Classical Greek Coinage*. London: Methuen, 1976, xx-xxvi, describes the changing emphasis, characteristically anonymising Kraay's own crucial contribution to the importance of hoard analysis.

¹¹¹ Kraay's influence also underlines the publication of Margaret Thompson, Otto Mørkholm, and Colin M. Kraay, eds, *An Inventory of Greek Coin Hoards*. New York: American Numismatic Society, 1973; the publication of this book was probably the single most important stimulus to the study of Greek coins by hoards, though it was built on the earlier editions by Sydney Noe (Edward T. Newell's assistant and follower) of 1925 and 1937.

¹¹² Michael H. Crawford, 'From Borghesi to Mommsen: the creation of an exact science', in Michael H. Crawford, Christopher Ligota, and Joseph B. Trapp, *Coins and Medals from Budé to Mommsen.* London: Warburg Institute, 1990, 125-32.

¹¹³One can compare his work with that of the contemporary Arthur Evans, whose 'The Horsemen of Tarentum' was published in *Numismatic Chronicle* 1889: Evans used hoard and die evidence, as well as style in his seriation of Tarentum's coinage. He was ahead of his time.

have no place in Head's work: only Eckhel's fifth criterion, 'style', remained. The influence of Winckelmann had triumphed.

We have seen how the concepts of style and of chronological divisions of Greek art used by Eckhel and Head both derived ultimately from Winckelmann, although neither explicitly acknowledged his debt; indeed Eckhel tended only to criticise Winckelmann. After Winckelmann, however, style was the key criterion used in the study of numismatics, especially for the dating of Greek coins. Because of the use of style by Eckhel and Head, the two figures who dominated the study of numismatics between the eighteenth and twentieth centuries, Winckelmann's influence on the subsequent history of Greek numismatics was dominant for two hundred years, even though his revolutionary approach was unacknowledged, criticised, and passed over in silence.¹¹⁴ As we have seen, other criteria for the study of coins were being developed, especially in the nineteenth century, and, with the benefit of hindsight, they have generally proved more reliable than style. The purely art-historical approach to ancient numismatics has now been dropped and replaced by the modern 'scientific' approaches of hoard- and die-studies,¹¹⁵ but only after two hundred years.

Winckelmann was an enthusiast for coins. He knew them and the numismatic literature very well, even though he accorded greater prominence to other forms of art when they were available. Yet the plentiful survival of ancient coins meant they were available for all periods and places, and so could be deployed when other evidence was thin or lacking. The dominance of the stylistic approach which Winckelmann applied to them was the silent legacy of the figure who first brought coins into the mainstream of considerations of art. His influence, though largely forgotten and perhaps indirect, could not have been more pervasive.

Andrew Burnett has been the President of the Royal Numismatic Society, the Roman Society, and the International Numismatic Commission. He retired from the British Museum in 2013, and recently published *'The Hidden Treasures of this Happy Island'. A History of Numismatics in Britain from the Renaissance to the Enlightenment* (2020).

andrewmburnett@hotmail.com



EXAMPLE 7 This work is licensed under a <u>Creative Commons Attribution-</u> <u>NonCommercial 4.0 International License</u>

¹¹⁴ See also François de Callataÿ, 'Greek coin types in context: a short state of the art', *Pharos*, 22: 1, 2016, 115-41, at 125: 'the triumph of art history (ca. 1880-1930)'.
¹¹⁵ Otto Mørkholm, 'A History of the Study of Greek Numismatics', *Nordisk Numismatisk Årsskrift*, 1979–1980, 5-21. Mørkholm began his study in 1760, just when the 'Winckelmann revolution' was about to take place. For the study of Greek coins before then, see Jonathan Kagan, 'Notes on the Study of Greek Coins in the Renaissance', in *Translatio Nummorum*. *Römische Kaiser in der Renaissance. Akten des Internationalen Symposiums, Berlin 16.–18. November 201*, Ulrike Peter and Bernhard Weisser, eds. Ruhpolding: Rutzen, 2013, 57-70.